



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,575	08/07/2000	Pawan Goyal	4466 US	3957
758	7590	12/17/2003		
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			EXAMINER MOORE, IAN N	
			ART UNIT 2661	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,575

Applicant(s)

GOYAL ET AL.

Examiner

Ian N Moore

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,4,6,7,9-13 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1,4,6,9, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228).

Regarding claim 1, Prieto '228 discloses a method for scheduling a resource to service a plurality of pending requests (see Fig 5; Uplink DAMA bandwidth allocation requests backlogged) received from a plurality of schedulable entities (see Fig. 1, User Earth terminals, UET), while preventing each schedulable entity from exceeding a maximum quality of service allocated to each schedulable entity, comprising:

selecting a request associated with a schedulable entity (see Fig. 5, PFQ-based scheduler 62 selects the winner/request from plurality of wholesaler queues 58; see col. 9, line 56-65);

responsive to determining that servicing the selected request will exceed the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see Fig. 3, Real-time bandwidth estimator 34 and Flow Control Module (FCM) 38; col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that real time bandwidth estimator monitors the available capacity for each and every priority

class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS . According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied.), advancing a virtual time for scheduling the requests (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted.), without servicing the request (see col. 10, line 47-55; since the request does not conform to the PFQ scheduler's criteria, it is not a winner. Thus, the request is delayed/denied.)

Responsive to determining that servicing the selected request does not exceed the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see Fig. 3, Real-time bandwidth estimator 34 and Flow Control Module (FCM) 38; col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that real time bandwidth estimator monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS or the other user's QoS . According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied.), servicing the request (see col. 9, line 37-65; since the request conforms to the PFQ scheduler's criteria, it is selected as a winner. Thus, the request is granted/selected) and advancing the virtual time (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing

Art Unit: 2661

the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted.).

Regarding Claim 4, Prieto '228 discloses the request includes a request for network bandwidth (see col. 13, line 35-55; the reservation request is the request that allocates an available time slot on a transmission resources (i.e. network bandwidth)).

Regarding Claim 6, Prieto '228 discloses the request is selected using a fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 11, line 24; a PFQ scheduler utilizes the fair scheduling algorithm).

Regarding Claim 9, Prieto '228 discloses the fair-share scheduling algorithm is a hierarchical fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 3, line 26-33; MAC controller uses a hierarchical uplink fair scheduling techniques).

Regarding Claim 13, Prieto '228 discloses the maximum quality of service allocated to each schedulable entity is a maximum percentage share of the resource (see col. 10, line 39-55 and see col. 11, line 10-12, 29-30; note that by utilizing the resource fencing, each user (i.e. schedulable entity) is guaranteed that they will get what they paid for when the network is busy. Thus, each user is receiving the percentage share of the bandwidth (i.e. guaranteed

subscription rate). Moreover, if there is any extra bandwidth, it is shared among users according to their QoS percentage (i.e. maximum percentage shared of bandwidth)).

Regarding Claim 14, Prieto '228 discloses a rate controller (Fig. 3 a combined system of Network Flow-Control Module (FCM) 38 and Real-Time Bandwidth Estimator 34) determines if servicing the request will exceed the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic)).

Regarding Claim 15, Prieto '228 discloses the rate controller determines that servicing the request will exceed the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service, the request remains pending (col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic). According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied. When the request is not granted (i.e. the PFQ scheduler does not select as a winner), the request must be pending/backlogged in the queues.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Bruno (U.S. 6,434,631).

Regarding Claim 2, Prieto '228 discloses a request as described above in claim 1.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a request to allocate disk space.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Bruno'631. In particular, Bruno'631 teaches a request to allocate disk space (see Fig. 1, DISK 22; col. 2, line 41- 65; a request of disk space).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Bruno'631, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by further providing a request for disk space, as taught by Bruno'631. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Bruno'631 since Bruno'631 states at col. 1, line 61-67 that such a modification would make it possible to provide a high cumulative service guarantees, low delay, and good fairness by assigning I/O disk space requests from various system elements to particular domains.

Art Unit: 2661

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Collins (U.S. 6,490,670).

Regarding Claim 3, Prieto '228 discloses a request as described above in claim 1.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a request to allocate memory.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Collins '670. In particular, Collins '670 teaches a request to allocate memory (see col. 7, line 26-30; a request to allocate memory).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Collins '670, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by further providing a request for memory, as taught by Collins '670. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Collins '670 since Collins '670 states at col. 2, line 1-20 that such a modification would make it possible to efficiently performing object allocation utilizing request because in the object-oriented environments, the objects are allocated extremely frequently.

3. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Rhee (U.S. 6,457,008).

Regarding Claim 5, Prieto '228 discloses a request as described above in claim 1.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a request for CPU processing cycles.

Art Unit: 2661

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Rhee'008. In particular, Rahee'008 teaches for CPU processing cycles (see Fig. 2, Resource Requesters 210 sending requests to the scheduler; col. 3, line 50-54; a request of CPU processing time).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Rhee'008, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by further providing a request for CPU processing time, as taught by Rhee'008. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Rhee'008 since Rhee'008 states at col. 2, line 52-60 that such a modification would make it possible to allocates schedule resource usage that allows efficient resource sharing with minimal waste of the resource. Such a method will allow greater control over scheduling decisions by a system administrator.

Regarding Claim 12, Prieto '228 discloses each request includes a method further including: limiting the request to a pre-determined upper bound (see col. 10, line 39-55 and see col. 11, line 10-12, 29-30; note that by utilizing the resource fencing, each user (i.e. schedulable entity) is guaranteed that they will get what they paid for when the network is busy. Thus, each user is receiving the percentage share of the bandwidth (i.e. predetermined upper bound guaranteed subscription rate).

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a requested duration.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Rhee'008. In particular, Rahee'008 teaches a requested duration (see Fig. 1, process 112-116; and Fig. 5B,

Art Unit: 2661

requested percentage duration for each users; col. 5, line 56-54; a request of CPU processing time/duration).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Rhee'008, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by further providing a request for CPU processing time/duration, as taught by Rhee'008. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Rhee'008 since Rhee'008 states at col. 2, line 52-60 that such a modification would make it possible to allocates schedule resource usage that allows efficient resource sharing with minimal waste of the resource. Such a method will allow greater control over scheduling decisions by a system administrator.

4. Claims 7, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Wallmeier (U.S. 5,748,614).

Regarding Claim 7, Prieto '228 discloses the fair-share scheduling algorithm is as described above in claim 6.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a weighted fair shared scheduling algorithm, each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Wallmeier'614. In particular, Wallmeier'614 teaches a weighted fair share scheduling algorithm (see Fig. 2, a weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)) each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation (col. 4, line 12-25; in WFQ, each backlogged stream/queue is served at minimum guarantee service rate (i.e. sustainable cell rate). Thus,

Art Unit: 2661

each stream/queue is serviced/allocated according to the assigned weight (i.e. assigned QoS for minimum guarantee rate)).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Wallmeier'614, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a mechanism to allocate/service the requests/packets from plurality of queues/streams fairly utilizing their weight/guaranteed rate, as taught by Wallmeier'614. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Wallmeier'614 since Wallmeier'614 states at col. 2, line 55-67 that such a modification would make it possible to serve a large buffer so that the available transmission bandwidth can be distributed among the different connections in a fair way utilizing "Weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)" to define a fair scheduling scheme.

Regarding Claim 8, Prieto '228 discloses the minimum quality of service allocated to each schedulable entity is a minimum percentage share of the resource (see col. 10, line 39-55 and see col. 11, line 10-12, 29-30; note that by utilizing the resource fencing, each user (i.e. schedulable entity) is guaranteed that they will get what they paid for when the network is busy. Thus, each user is receiving the percentage share of the bandwidth (i.e. minimum percentage of the guaranteed subscription rate)).

Regarding Claim 10, Prieto '228 discloses the hierarchical fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 3, line 26-33; MAC controller uses a hierarchical uplink fair scheduling techniques.)

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a weighted fair shared scheduling algorithm, each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Wallmeier'614. In particular, Wallmeier'614 teaches a weighted fair share scheduling algorithm (see Fig. 2, a weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)) each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation (col. 4, line 12-25; in WFQ, each backlogged stream/queue is served at minimum guarantee service rate (i.e. sustainable cell rate). Thus, each stream/queue is serviced/allocated according to the assigned weight (i.e. assigned QoS for minimum guarantee rate)).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Wallmeier'614, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a mechanism to allocate/service the requests/packets from plurality of queues/streams fairly utilizing their weight/guaranteed rate, as taught by Wallmeier'614. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Wallmeier'614 since Wallmeier'614 states at col. 2, line 55-67 that such a modification would make it possible to serve a large buffer so that the available transmission bandwidth can be distributed among the different connections in a fair way utilizing "Weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)" to define a fair scheduling scheme.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Chow (U.S. 6,438,134).

Regarding Claim 11, Prieto '228 discloses the fair-share scheduling algorithm and the virtual time scheduling as described above in claim 1 and 6.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose is a start-time fair queuing algorithm with virtual time scheduling.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Chow'134. In particular, Chow'134 teaches a start-time fair queuing algorithm (see col.9, line 60-65; WFQ sub-scheduler utilizes Start-time fair queuing schemed) with virtual time scheduling (see col. 8, line 45-56; utilizing the a time stamping for each queue/packet which is used weighted fair queuing).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Chow'134, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a start-time fair queuing schemed, as taught by Chow'134. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Chow'134 since Chow'134 states at col. 2, line 1-20 that such a modification would make it possible to service a particular queue with the guaranteed allocated service rate during its busy period utilizing the work conserving idle bandwidth scheduler, such as a WFQ scheduler.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228), Srinivasan (U.S. 5,991,812) and Chow' 134, in view of Rahee'008.

Regarding claim 16, Prieto '228 discloses a method for scheduling resource requests (see Fig 5; Uplink DAMA bandwidth allocation requests backlogged) from a plurality of

schedulable entities (see Fig. 1, User Earth terminals, UET), and each schedulable entity has a maximum quality of service guarantee, the method comprising:

selecting the resource request, the selected request having an associated schedulable entity (see Fig.5, PFQ-based scheduler 62 selects the winner/request from plurality of wholesaler queues 58; see col. 9, line 56-65);

limiting of the selected resource request to a pre-determined duration upper bound (see col. 10, line 39-55 and see col. 11, line 10-12, 29-30; note that by utilizing the resource fencing, each user (i.e. schedulable entity) is guaranteed that they will get what they paid for when the network is busy. Thus, each user is receiving the percentage share of the bandwidth (i.e. predetermined upper bound guaranteed subscription rate);

servicing the selected resource request (see col. 9, line 37-65; when the request conforms to the PFQ scheduler's criteria, it is selected as a winner. Thus, the request is granted/selected/serviced.) if servicing the selected resource request will not exceed the associated schedulable entity's maximum quality of service guarantee (see Fig. 3, Real-time bandwidth estimator 34 and Flow Control Module (FCM) 38; col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that real time bandwidth estimator monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS. According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied);

and advancing a virtual time (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-

stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted.)

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose assigning a start number tag to a resource request, selecting the resource request with the smallest start number tag, and advancing a virtual time value.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Srinivasan'812. In particular, Srinivasan'812 teaches assigning a start number tag (see Fig. 5, Queue virtual time computer 502 and TR System clock 410; see col. 5, line 51 to col. 6, line 6; note that each packet is stamped with a packet virtual time (TVP)) to a resource request (see Fig. 1, Bandwidths requirements B1-BN and the queues of Q1 to QN; see col. 4, line 42-67; note that the packets with different bandwidth requirements are the resource requests),

selecting the resource request with the smallest start number tag (see Fig. 7; Queue selection Computer 702; and see col. 2, line 60-67; col. 11, line 20-38; note that the packet with the lowest virtual time is selected.) and

advancing a virtual time value (see col.2, line 56 to col. 3, line 4; note that after a packet is selected, the queue virtual time value (TVQ) is incremented).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Srinivasan'812, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a virtual time mechanism in a scheduler in order to select the packets from plurality of queues, as taught by Srinivasan'812. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by

Srinivasan'812 since Srinivasan'812 states at col. 2, line 34-36 that such a modification would make it possible to provide fair queuing methods and apparatus that employ computationally efficient techniques to facilitate efficient hardware and software implementation.

Neither Prieto '228 nor Srinivasan'812 explicitly discloses using a start-time fair queuing algorithm with virtual time scheduling.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Chow'134. In particular, Chow'134 teaches using a start-time fair queuing algorithm (see col.9, line 60-65; WFQ sub-scheduler utilizes Start-time fair queuing schemed) with virtual time scheduling (see col. 8, line 45-56; utilizing the a time stamping for each queue/packet which is used weighted fair queuing).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812, and then given the teaching of Chow'134, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812, by providing a start-time fair queuing schemed, as taught by Chow'134. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Chow'134 since Chow'134 states at col. 2, line 1-20 that such a modification would make it possible to service a particular queue with the guaranteed allocated service rate during its busy period utilizing the work conserving idle bandwidth scheduler, such as a WFQ scheduler.

Neither Prieto '228, Srinivasan'812, nor Chow'134 explicitly discloses that each resource request includes a requested duration.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Rhee'008. In particular, Rahee'008 teaches each resource request includes a requested duration (see Fig. 1, process 112-116; and Fig. 5B, requested percentage duration for each users; col. 5, line 56-54; a request of CPU processing time/duration).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228, Srinivasan'812 and Chow'134, then given the teaching of Rahee'008, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228, Srinivasan'812 and Chow'134, by further providing a request for CPU processing time/duration, as taught by Rahee'008. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Rhee'008 since Rhee'008 states at col. 2, line 52-60 that such a modification would make it possible to allocates schedule resource usage that allows efficient resource sharing with minimal waste of the resource. Such a method will allow greater control over scheduling decisions by a system administrator.

Regarding claim 17, the combined system of Prieto '228, Rahee'008 and Chow'134 discloses that updating the start number tag (i.e. virtual time stamp) for of the selected resource request as described above in Claim 16. Furthermore, Prieto '228 discloses holding/queuing a resource request associated with the schedulable entity that made the selected resource request if the selected resource request is not serviced (note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other

user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic).

According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied. When the request is not granted/service (i.e. the PFQ scheduler does not select as a winner), the request must be pending/backlogged in the queues.)

Note that Prieto '228 teaches the request selecting/granting process according to fair queuing algorithm and the flow control mechanism. Srinivasan'812 teaches the selecting/granting process according to virtual time. In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228, Rahee'008 and Chow'134, then given the teaching of Srinivasan'812, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228, Rahee'008 and Chow'134, by defining a selecting mechanism with incrementing the virtual time when selected (as taught by Srinivasan'812) and delayed/denied the request when the fair share scheduling and flow control mechanism can not be satisfied. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Srinivasan'812 as described above in Claim 16.

Regarding claim 18, Prieto '228 discloses leaving the selected resource request pending if servicing the selected resource request will exceed the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service guarantee (note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic). According to the determination based upon

QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted/delayed/denied. When the request is not granted/service (i.e. the PFQ scheduler does not select as a winner), the request must be pending/backlogged in the queues.)

7. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Beshi'721 (U.S. 6,580,721).

Regarding claim 19, Prieto '228 discloses a system for scheduling pending resource requests (see Fig 5; Uplink DAMA bandwidth allocation requests backlogged) from a plurality of schedulable entities (see Fig. 1, User Earth terminals, UET) while limiting a maximum quality of service allocated to each schedulable entity, comprising:

a plurality of schedulable entity queues (see Fig. 5, Wholesaler queues 58) for holding pending resource requests (see Fig. 5, Backlogged requests), each schedulable entity queue holding resource requests from a schedulable entity (see col. 9, line 38-51; each wholesaler queue contains the RQM messages from the UET);

a scheduler (see Fig. 5, PFQ based Scheduler 62) for selecting resource requests from the plurality of schedulable entity queues (see col. 9, line 56-65; note that PFQ-based scheduler 62 selects the winner/request from plurality of wholesaler queues 58) using a fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 11, line 24-26; fair scheduling algorithm), and further adapted to increment a virtual time value each time a resource request is selected (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is

piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted); and

a rate controller associated with the schedulable entity queues (Fig. 3 a combined system of Network Flow-Control Module (FCM) 38 and Real-Time Bandwidth Estimator 34 which couple to queues inside MAC controller), the rate controller adapted to limit the rate at which resource requests selected by the scheduler are serviced to the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic).

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a plurality of rate controllers associated with the plurality of schedulable entity queues.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Beshi'721. In particular, Beshi'721 teaches a plurality of rate controllers associated with the plurality of schedulable entity queues (see Fig. 20, a plurality of Service-rate Controllers 144 which corresponds to a plurality of buffers 145 and collection queues 174; see col. 30, line 54-67).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Beshi'721, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a plurality of rate controllers for each buffer/queue, as taught by Beshi'721. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Beshi'721 since Beshi'721 states at col. 2, line 41-45

and col.4, line 3-14 that such a modification would make it possible to provide an apparatus to regulate the rate allocation in the network.

Regarding claim 20, the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721 discloses the pluralities of rate controllers as described above in Claim 19. Furthermore, Prieto '228 discloses a rate controller is further adapted to: monitor the servicing of resource requests from the rate controller's associated schedulable entity queue to calculate the quality of service received by the schedulable entity (see col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic); and block the servicing of a selected resource request if the schedulable entity's maximum quality of service would be exceeded if the selected resource request was serviced (see col. 10, line 47-55; since the request does not conform to the PFQ scheduler's criteria, it is not a winner. Thus, the request is delayed/denied/blocked.)

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Beshi'721, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, for the same way as stated above. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Beshi'721 for the same reason as stated above in Claim 19.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) and Beshi'721, as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Wallmeier (U.S. 5,748,614).

Regarding Claim 21, the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721 discloses the scheduler uses a fair-share queuing algorithm as described above in claim 19.

Prieto '228 does not explicitly each schedulable entity queue is associated with a weight and a weighted fair-share queuing algorithm.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Wallmeier'614. In particular, Wallmeier'614 teaches each schedulable entity queue is associated with a weight (col. 4, line 12-25; in WFQ, each backlogged stream/queue is served at minimum guarantee service rate (i.e. sustainable cell rate). Thus, each queue/stream is serviced/allocated according corresponding assigned weight (i.e. assigned QoS for minimum guarantee rate) and a weighted fair-share queuing algorithm (see Fig. 2, a weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721, and then given the teaching of Wallmeier'614, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721, by providing a mechanism to allocate/service the requests/packets from plurality of queues/streams fairly utilizing their weight/guaranteed rate, as taught by Wallmeier'614. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Wallmeier'614 since Wallmeier'614 states at col. 2, line 55-67 that such a modification would make it possible to serve a large buffer so that the available transmission bandwidth can be

Art Unit: 2661

distributed among the different connections in a fair way utilizing "Weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)" to define a fair scheduling scheme.

9. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) and Beshi'721 (U.S. 6,580,721), in view of Ganmukhi (U.S. 5,850,399).

Regarding claim 22, Prieto '228 discloses a hierarchical system (see col. 16, line 11-24; the system utilizes a hierarchical uplink fair scheduling techniques) for scheduling resource requests (see Fig 5; Uplink DAMA bandwidth allocation requests backlogged) from a plurality of child schedulable entities (see Fig. 1, User Earth terminals, UET) while limiting the maximum quality of service allocated to a plurality of parent schedulable entities, comprising:

a plurality of child schedulable entity queues (see Fig. 5, Wholesaler queues 58) for holding pending resource requests (see Fig. 5, Backlogged requests), each child schedulable entity queue holding resource requests from a child schedulable entity (see col. 9, line 38-51; each wholesaler queue contains the RQM messages from the UET);

one or more child schedulers (see Fig. 5, PFQ based Scheduler 62) for selecting resource requests from the plurality of child schedulable entity queues (see col. 9, line 56-65; note that PFQ-based scheduler 62 selects the winner/request from plurality of wholesaler queues 58) using a fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 11, line 24-26; fair scheduling algorithm), and further adapted to transmit selected resource requests to a parent schedulable entity queue (see Fig. 6, Retailer Queues 60 which receives the winner from stage 1 (i.e. the output of PFQ scheduler from Wholesaler queues); also see col. 9, line 38-64);

a plurality of parent schedulable entity queues (see Fig. 6, Retailer user queues 60), each parent schedulable entity queue receiving resource requests (see Fig. 6, Quantum requests) from the child schedulable entity queues (see col. 9, line 38-51; each retailer queue (i.e. parent queue) holds the quantum request from a wholesaler queue.), each parent schedulable entity queue holding resource requests received from one of the child schedulers (see Fig. 6, Retailer Queues 60 receives the winner request from stage 1 (i.e. the output of PFQ scheduler from Wholesaler queues); also see col. 9, line 38-64);

a parent scheduler (see Fig. 6, PFQ based Scheduler 64) for selecting resource requests from the plurality of parent schedulable entity queues (see col. 10, line 1-9; note that PFQ-based scheduler 64 selects the winner/request from plurality of retailer queues 60) using a fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 11, line 24-26; fair scheduling algorithm), and further adapted to increment a virtual time value each time a resource request is selected (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted); and

a rate controller associated with the plurality of parent schedulable entity queues (Fig. 3 a combined system of Network Flow-Control Module (FCM) 38 and Real-Time Bandwidth Estimator 34 which couple to queues inside MAC controller), the rate controller adapted to limit the rate at which resource requests selected by the parent scheduler are serviced to a parent schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34;

note that the combined system of real time bandwidth estimator and FCM monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS (i.e. determining whether or not a new user will congest the other traffic).

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a plurality of rate controllers associated with the plurality of parent schedulable entity queues.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Beshi'721. In particular, Beshi'721 teaches a plurality of rate controllers associated with the plurality of schedulable entity queues (see Fig. 20, a plurality of Service-rate Controllers 144 which corresponds to a plurality of buffers 145 and collection queues 174; see col. 30, line 54-67).

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Rhee'008, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by providing a plurality of rate controllers for each buffer/queue, as taught by Beshi'721. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Beshi'721 since Beshi'721 states at col. 2, line 41-45 and col.4, line 3-14 that such a modification would make it possible to provide an apparatus to regulate the rate allocation in the network.

Neither Prieto '228 nor Beshi'721 explicitly discloses receiving from a subset of the child schedulable entity queues.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Ganmukhi'399. In particular, Ganmukhi'399 teaches receiving from a subset of the child schedulable entity

queues (see Fig. 1, MSTCFQ scheduler 80 receives the plurality of selected packets from a portion/subset/part of the queues (i.e. a subset of the child schedulable entity queues) at input 15; col. 4, line 53-65).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721, then given the teaching of Ganmukhi'399, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228 and Beshi'721, by providing a mechanism to receive packets from the portion/subset/part of the input queues, as taught by Ganmukhi'399. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Ganmukhi'399 since Ganmukhi'399 states at col. 2, line 52-60 that such a modification would make it possible to implement a scheduler which is a cost effective and handles the QoS requirements of different sessions fairly and efficiently.

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) in view of Srinivasan'812.

Regarding claim 23, Prieto '228 discloses scheduling a plurality of pending requests (see Fig 5; Uplink DAMA bandwidth allocation requests backlogged) for service from a resource received from a plurality of schedulable entities (see Fig. 1, User Earth terminals, UET), while preventing each schedulable entity from exceeding a maximum quality of service allocated to each schedulable entity, comprising:

program code (see col. 12, line 35-40; a program/software application which operates on a demand assigned multiple access system) that selects a request associated with a schedulable entity (see col. 9, line 56-65; note that PFQ-based scheduler 62 selects the

winner/request from plurality of wholesaler queues 58) using a fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 11, line 24-26; fair scheduling algorithm);

program code that services the request if a rate controller (Fig. 3 a combined system of Network Flow-Control Module (FCM) 38 and Real-Time Bandwidth Estimator 34) determines that servicing the request will not exceed the associated schedulable entity's maximum quality of service (see Fig. 3, Real-time bandwidth estimator 34 and Flow Control Module (FCM) 38; col. 7, line 47 to col. 8, line 34; note that real time bandwidth estimator monitors the available capacity for each and every priority class/connection and aggregate bandwidths and determines whether or not granting a request to a new potential user will effect the QoS for the other user's QoS. According to the determination based upon QoS, the allocation RQM request can be granted); and

program code that advances a virtual time in the fair-share scheduling algorithm (see col. 10, line 10-57; note that a virtual time (i.e. virtual time stamp) is estimated and used for each request in ascending order. Thus, when implementing the ascending order, the time must be advanced/incremented. Also, the time-stamp is used as a key for sorting the request, and it is piece-wise monotonically increasing. Thus, it is clear that the virtual time stamp must be incremented whether or not the request is granted.)

Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a computer program product and a computer readable medium that stores program code.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Srinivasan'812. In particular, Srinivasan'812 teaches a computer program product (see col. 12, line 50-53 and col. 18, line 16-30; a queue section apparatus can be implemented on a computer using any

Art Unit: 2661

software driven computer implemented operations.) and a computer readable medium that stores program code (see col. 12, line 66 to col. 12, line 16 and col. 14, line 22-44; note that the queue selection apparatus/method/program can be stored in the computer. The computer readable medium can be any data storage that can store data.)

In view of this, having the system of Prieto '228 and then given the teaching of Srinivasan'812, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Prieto '228, by implementing the queue selection method/apparatus/software on a computer system by storing the selection software on the computer data storage and operating the selection process utilizing stored application/program, as taught by Srinivasan'812. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Srinivasan'812 since Srinivasan'812 states at col. 2, line 34-36 that such a modification would make it possible to provide the fair queuing methods/apparatus/software that employ computationally efficient techniques to facilitate efficient hardware and software implementation, and Srinivasan'812 also suggests at col. 12, line 50-52 that the queue selection method may be implemented using any type of integrated circuit logic or software driven computer-implemented operations.

11. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) and Srinivasan'812, as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Wallmeier (U.S. 5,748,614).

Regarding Claim 24, the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812 discloses the computer program product with the fair-share scheduling algorithm is as described above in claim 23.

Neither Prieto '228 nor Srinivasan'812 explicitly discloses a weighted fair shared scheduling algorithm, each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Wallmeier'614. In particular, Wallmeier'614 teaches a weighted fair share scheduling algorithm (see Fig. 2, a weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)) each weight corresponding to a schedulable entity's minimum quality of service allocation (col. 4, line 12-25; in WFQ, each backlogged stream/queue is served at minimum guarantee service rate (i.e. sustainable cell rate). Thus, each stream/queue is serviced/allocated according to the assigned weight (i.e. assigned QoS for minimum guarantee rate)).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812, and then given the teaching of Wallmeier'614, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812, by providing a mechanism to allocate/service the requests/packets from plurality of queues/streams fairly utilizing their weight/guaranteed rate, as taught by Wallmeier'614. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Wallmeier'614 since Wallmeier'614 states at col. 2, line 55-67 that such a modification would make it possible to serve a large buffer so that the available transmission bandwidth can be

Art Unit: 2661

distributed among the different connections in a fair way utilizing "Weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ)" to define a fair scheduling scheme.

12. Claims 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto (U.S. 6,381,228) and Srinivasan'812, as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Rahee'008.

Regarding Claim 25, the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812 discloses a computer program product and program/method code as described above in claim 23. Furthermore, Prieto '228 discloses each request includes the method that limits the request to a pre-determined upper bound (see col. 10, line 39-55 and see col. 11, line 10-12, 29-30; note that by utilizing the resource fencing, each user (i.e. schedulable entity) is guaranteed that they will get what they paid for when the network is busy. Thus, each user is receiving the percentage share of the bandwidth (i.e. predetermined upper bound guaranteed subscription rate). Prieto '228 does not explicitly disclose a requested duration.

Neither Prieto '228 nor Srinivasan'812 explicitly discloses a requested duration.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are taught by Rhee'008. In particular, Rahee'008 teaches a requested duration (see Fig. 1, process 112-116; and Fig. 5B, requested percentage duration for each users; col. 5, line 56-54; a request of CPU processing time/duration).

In view of this, having the combined system of Prieto '228 and Srinivasan'812, then given the teaching of Rhee'008, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Prieto '228 and

Art Unit: 2661

Srinivasan'812, by further providing a request for CPU processing time/duration, as taught by Rhee'008. The motivation to combine is to obtain the advantages/benefits taught by Rhee'008 since Rhee'008 states at col. 2, line 52-60 that such a modification would make it possible to allocates schedule resource usage that allows efficient resource sharing with minimal waste of the resource. Such a method will allow greater control over scheduling decisions by a system administrator.

Art Unit: 2661

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian N Moore whose telephone number is 703-605-1531. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Olms can be reached on 703-305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-9509.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Ian N Moore
Examiner
Art Unit 2661

INM
12/9/03


RICKY NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER